



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT SERVICE
1400 KEY BOULEVARD
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-5144

NOV 2 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Classification Guidance for Contract Oversight Responsibilities

This transmits classification guidance (attached) for positions with responsibilities for contract oversight work. This guidance may be used to classify applicable positions in the Department of Defense (DoD).

The work involved in ensuring that contractor services or products meet quality requirements varies significantly in the primary knowledges, skills, and abilities required, and in the duties and responsibilities involved. There is no single series, or set of grading criteria, that covers all situations involving contract oversight responsibilities. This guidance is intended to promote consistent use of the available classification tools. Specifically, it provides guidelines for determining series and pay plan, and outlines a number of standards and guides that may be used, or adapted, for determining grades of positions in a variety of situations. It may be used in the adjudication of DoD classification appeals of positions performing these types of oversight responsibilities.

Questions on this guidance should be directed to Janice W. Cooper, Chief, Classification Appeals Adjudication Section, at (703) 696-6301, extension 309.


Ginger Groeber
Director

Attachment:
As stated

DISTRIBUTION: DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
(CIVILIAN PERSONNEL POLICY),
DIRECTOR, PLANS, PROGRAMS, AND DIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
DEPUTY DIRECTOR, PERSONNEL FORCE MANAGEMENT,
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
DIRECTOR FOR MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL (J-1),
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
DIRECTOR, PERSONNEL AND SECURITY,
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL
DIRECTOR, HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT, DEFENSE
COMMISSARY AGENCY
CHIEF, HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION,
DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY
DIRECTOR FOR HUMAN RESOURCES,
DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE
CHIEF, CIVILIAN PERSONNEL DIVISION, DEFENSE
INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY
CHIEF, OFFICE OF HUMAN RESOURCES,
DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, HUMAN RESOURCES,
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, HUMAN RESOURCES, DEFENSE
CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY
DIRECTOR, HUMAN RESOURCES, DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE
DIRECTOR, MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL, DEFENSE THREAT
REDUCTION AGENCY
DIRECTOR, HUMAN RESOURCES,
NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY
DIRECTOR, HUMAN RESOURCES SERVICES,
NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY
DIRECTOR, PERSONNEL CENTER, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
EDUCATION ACTIVITY
DIRECTOR FOR PERSONNEL AND SECURITY,
WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES
DIRECTOR, CIVILIAN HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT,
UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIVERSITY OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES
DIRECTOR FOR HUMAN RESOURCES, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

CLASSIFICATION GUIDANCE FOR POSITIONS WITH CONTRACT OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITIES

Purpose

The purpose of the material contained in this guidance is to provide assistance in interpreting and applying the classification standards published by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to Department of Defense (DoD) positions with contract oversight responsibilities. It is not intended to affect Commercial Activities or other studies undertaken to determine whether or not to contract out a function, nor management decisions to use contract employees. It is solely for the purpose of ensuring correct classification of Federal positions that have responsibilities for overseeing work being performed by contract employees. It may be used in the adjudication of DoD classification appeals of positions with these types of oversight responsibilities.

Background

The Department of the Air Force requested position classification guidance for oversight responsibilities with regard to work performed by contractors, particularly in the area of service contracts.

Introduction

The three types of positions involving contract oversight responsibilities are: nonsupervisory, supervisory, and direction of a contract workforce. Nonsupervisory oversight work is sometimes referred to as quality assurance evaluation (QAE) work. Supervisory positions are those that are covered by the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG) that also oversee contractors. Direction of a contract workforce refers to positions with responsibility for ongoing contractor-performed work, but that do not meet the GSSG nor the FWS supervisory coverage requirements. The following guidance discusses determining pay plan, series, and grading criteria for these three categories.

Contracts vary widely in the types of work performed and the outcomes expected: manufacture of items, maintenance and repair of manufactured items; deliverables such as studies, reports, recommendations, software applications; basic services such as food, custodial, buildings and grounds maintenance, security; specialized services such as information technology (IT) support, training, human resources operations, budget processes. The work involved in contract oversight varies significantly in the duties and responsibilities involved, and therefore in the primary knowledges, skills, and abilities

required to perform the work. The variety in function and knowledge of the oversight personnel, and in the kinds of contract operations, are such as to preclude any simplified approach to classification. This is particularly true in view of the published classification standards available. There is presently no single series or set of grading criteria that can cover all, or even most, situations involving contract oversight. The classification tools provided by the existing system often require considerable adaptation and interpretation. This guidance is to enable the best and most consistent application of these tools, and to provide suggestions for appropriate standards in each of the three types of contract oversight responsibilities. Specifically, it provides guidelines for determining series and pay plan, and outlines a number of standards and guides that may be used, or adapted, for determining grades of positions in a variety of situations.

We have included a summary chart at Appendix A that illustrates the concepts discussed in the body of the guidance.

Pay Plan Determination

Where the contract workforce is performing work that is similar to General Schedule (GS) work (work that requires knowledge or experience of an administrative, clerical, scientific, artistic or technical nature), the pay plan determination for oversight positions of all three types—nonsupervisory, supervisory, and direction of a workforce—is straightforward, i.e., GS. Contractors that provide services of trade, craft, and/or manual labor nature, that is, wage grade type work, present a more difficult issue. The requirements for placement in the Federal Wage System (FWS) are stringent. For example, nonsupervisory oversight positions in a wage-type setting may appear to be classifiable as wage grade inspectors. However, positions coded as wage grade inspectors require a **full knowledge** of the trade or craft to inspect the work, a level of knowledge that is often not required of the oversight employee. Additional insight on this matter is found in the first exclusion listed in the GS-809 Construction Control Series Standard: “(p)ositions primarily responsible...for inspecting the quality of work of employees in trades or crafts, or equipment operators, requiring personal knowledge and experience in the trade, craft, or manual labor occupation, are excluded from the GS system. For example, if the supervisor or the inspector **must be able to perform the trade or craft work being inspected** (emphasis added) to determine whether the finished work is acceptable, the position is classified and graded under the Federal Wage System.” This requirement is a strong indication against any automatic classification of positions overseeing wage grade work as FWS Inspectors.

The paramount knowledges required to oversee wage grade type operations are not necessarily of a trade, craft, or manual labor nature. Full trade and craft knowledge is not necessarily required to make judgments on the quality of the work performed. Often, what is required is general familiarity with the work sufficient to make determinations about whether or not performance is satisfactory. Where this is the case, the positions are

covered by the GS. Other knowledges often required by the oversight function, that is, ability to perform some analysis in evaluating the work, to review contractor-developed operations manuals for adequacy and accuracy, to apply agency and installation regulations, and to write reports, would further argue in favor of coverage under the GS for such positions. However, in those cases where oversight **requires full performance knowledge** of the trade or craft work being performed, such positions should be coded to the FWS pay plan. Because this situation is relatively rare, the remainder of this guidance discusses GS positions only.

Series Determination

General Principles

Work involving contract oversight responsibilities is typically coded to the subject-matter series that corresponds to the paramount knowledge requirement for effective monitoring of the contracted work. That is, the knowledge that is paramount for analyzing the quality and acceptability of the contractor's work governs the series of the position with responsibility for 1) ensuring that the contract work meets specifications; 2) correcting or improving the work where needed; and 3) making recommendations or decisions about continuing or not continuing to use a particular contract firm. For example, information technology work that is contracted out, e.g., a help desk, should normally be reviewed by persons fully qualified in the information technology field.

Contract oversight responsibilities do not require technical knowledge of contracting sufficient to be classified to the GS-1102 Contracting Series or related series. Some oversight positions function as contract officers' technical representatives (COTRs), or contract officers' representatives (CORs). Both COTR/COR and non-COTR/COR oversight positions are coded to the appropriate subject-matter series.

For oversight of contracted work that is two-grade interval in nature, the appropriate two-grade interval subject-matter series should be selected, administrative or professional depending on the work reviewed. For oversight of contracted work that is single-grade interval in nature, e.g., personnel processing work, the knowledge needed to evaluate the work, integrate it into the larger operation (if any), make corrections, provide analytical reports to management, and the like, may be two-grade interval in nature. Each situation should, however, be carefully evaluated since oversight of single-grade interval work may be properly single-grade interval in nature. Oversight of contracted work that requires *professional* knowledge (e.g., engineering, scientific research, librarianship, accounting) to ensure quality should be overseen by an employee or employees coded to the appropriate *professional* series. In the engineering field, work that requires evaluation by an employee or employees with engineering knowledge at less than the professional level may be coded to the GS-802 Engineering Technician Series.

Where the work reviewed is mixed and no clear series determination is possible, the guidelines for coding mixed series positions found in the Introduction to the

Classification Standards and the Classifier's Handbook should be followed. In many cases, the general or "-01" series in the occupational group may be used for mixed series situations, or where the subject-matter knowledge required is not covered by a published series. For example, the Departments of the Air Force and Navy have made use of the GS-1101 General Business and Industry Series for oversight over some types of contracts. The GS-1601 General Facilities and Equipment Series* may be appropriate to many contract oversight positions that require some knowledge of trades, crafts, and laboring work. If the nature of the contracted work is predominantly supply or transportation, the general series in the GS-2000 Supply Group or in the GS-2100 Transportation Group respectively should be considered. A number of OPM appeal decisions have supported the use of the GS-802 Engineering Technician Series for oversight of public works and facilities engineering functions. The GS-809 Construction Control Series may in some cases be appropriate if construction (or similar) work is involved, and GS-802 Engineering Technician knowledges are not required. Series such as GS-080 Security Administration or GS-1667 Steward may be appropriate for contracted guard forces or food service operations, respectively.

Positions that direct a function performed by a contract workforce, but are excluded from the GSSG, present a different series issue. Series that describe administrative/managerial functions may be the most adaptable to the principal duties and responsibilities for these positions. Examples of these are the GS-080 Security Administration, GS-1144 Commissary Store Management, GS-1640 Facilities Management, GS-1173 Housing Management and GS-670 Health System Administration Series.

In general, use the GS-301 Miscellaneous Administration and Program Series, with appropriate selective placement factors, **only** where no other series can be used.

The above is not intended to be an exhaustive list. Series determination must be made based on the particular work overseen, the knowledges needed to make judgments on the quality of that work, and the kinds of duties and responsibilities assigned to the Federal employee.

Applicability of GS-1910

An important issue in determining the correct series is the propriety of the GS-1910 Quality Assurance Series for contract oversight responsibilities. The use of terms such as QAE to describe much of the nonsupervisory oversight work in many settings can lead to confusion on the applicability of the GS-1910 Series. The GS-1910 Series covers work concerned with assuring the quality of products acquired and used by the Federal Government. The work involves: (1) the development of plans and programs for achieving and maintaining product quality throughout the item's life cycle; (2) monitoring operations to prevent the production of defects and to verify adherence to quality plans and requirements; and (3) analysis and investigation of adverse quality trends or conditions and initiation of corrective action. When contractors are involved,

* Note that this reference is for series only. The grading criteria in the GS-1601 standard are for manager positions only, and inapplicable to contract monitoring work.

GS-1910 work includes ensuring that contractors provide adequate quality assurance procedures and evaluation techniques in order that finished products conform to technical requirements. It involves application of quality assurance methodology, ranging from basic measurements and tests of quality characteristics to advanced quality assurance knowledges and techniques. The grading criteria are linked directly to the type of product or products involved: complex products vs. less complex products. This makes the GS-1910 Quality Assurance Series Standard of limited use in classifying contract oversight work, and therefore inappropriate as a general tool. It is particularly inapplicable in the growing area of service contracts where there is no product or item per se (e.g., food service, buildings and grounds maintenance, information technology services). Classify **only** those contract oversight assignments that **fully meet** the definition for the GS-1910 Series as described in the standard and can be properly evaluated by the grading criteria in the standard--to the GS-1910 Quality Assurance Series.

Grade Determination for Nonsupervisory Positions

Determining the grade for nonsupervisory contract oversight responsibilities in GS type operations should be done wherever possible by using the criteria in the governing subject-matter standard(s). Many subject matter standards with grading criteria contain either specific reference to contract oversight responsibilities, or have other criteria that can be adapted to this type of work, such as general program evaluation, guidance, oversight, and review duties and responsibilities. Where this is not the case, criteria from the most closely related subject-matter standard should be selected, following the principles for cross-series comparison in the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards and The Classifier's Handbook. That is, the standard or standards with grading criteria that are closest to the position in question with respect to kinds of work processes and subject matter, qualifications required, and pattern of grade level characteristics should be selected.

The Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide (AAGEG) can be used, with care, as a tool for evaluating contract oversight responsibilities across occupational lines. The most important aspect of nonsupervisory contract oversight responsibilities is typically technical, i.e., subject-matter knowledge, which therefore should be the governing factor in selecting appropriate grading criteria. As stated in the "Coverage" section of the AAGEG, work covered by the guide is administrative in nature and does not require specialized subject-matter knowledge and skills. Further, in the "Exclusions" section, exclusions 3 and 5 point strongly to the use of specific subject-matter standards where specialized technical skills or specialized administrative duties and responsibilities covered by subject-matter standards are paramount.

The AAGEG does measure "qualitative and/or quantitative analytical skills, the ability to research problems and issues, written and oral communication skills, and the application of mature judgment in problem solving." These general skills and abilities are frequently required, to a greater or lesser degree, of employees exercising contract oversight

responsibilities along with the necessary subject-matter knowledges. In cases where there is a governing subject-matter standard, the AAGEG may be used as a supplementary standard to measure duties requiring these general skills, in addition to the governing subject-matter standard selected to measure the technical work. In cases where there is no governing subject-matter standard, or where the primary duties do not require specialized subject-matter knowledge and skills, the AAGEG may be appropriate as the principal standard for grading such positions. However, the AAGEG should not be automatically applied where cross-series comparison is needed, but only where it meets the principles set forth in the Introduction and Classifier's Handbook as noted above.

Positions with contract oversight responsibilities that are similar to, or meet the definition for, program analyst positions are best evaluated using the AAGEG. Program analyst positions are those that primarily serve as analysts and advisors to management on the evaluation of the effectiveness of programs and operations, use analytical and evaluative methods and techniques for assessing program development or execution, and require skill in application of factfinding and investigative techniques.

Appendix B contains sample factor level progressions, based on the AAGEG, for Factors 1, 3, 4, and 5, that may assist in grading some types of two-grade interval nonsupervisory contract oversight responsibilities. This material is an aid to classification, not a substitute for classification standards. It cannot be used alone.

For some positions with contract oversight responsibilities in the GS-1601 and the GS-1101 Series, the grading criteria found in the GS-809 Series may be the most appropriate. Some OPM appeal decisions support application of the GS-809 grading criteria to GS-1601 positions.

The grading criteria in the GS-1910 standard should normally be used only where those specific knowledges and skills are paramount. *Since the GS-1910 grading criteria are directly linked to the characteristics of products, complex or less complex, they are not applicable as a cross-reference for contract operations that do not involve items, equipment, or systems developed, produced, and acquired by Federal agencies.*

In those situations where full trades and craft knowledges are required, that is, where the work is covered by the FWS, the criteria in the appropriate FWS job grading standard (JGS) or standards may be adaptable. Where such work fully meets the coverage requirements of the FWS JGS for Inspectors, the criteria in that standard are appropriate.

Leader Grading Guides

The criteria in Parts I and II of the General Schedule Leader Grade Evaluation Guide (GSLGEG) are not applicable to this type of work. Positions exercising responsibilities for contract oversight do not function as work leaders or team leaders as required by the GSLGEG, i.e., performing the work as well as leading, nor do they meet the seven coaching and mentoring functions required for coverage by Part II of the Guide. The FWS Leader Standard is similarly inapplicable.

Grade Determination for Direction of Contract Operations

Managing work carried out wholly or partially by a contract workforce requires not only the technical knowledges needed to evaluate the quality of the work, but also administrative abilities, knowledge and skill in planning and coordination, and for some positions, responsibilities for integrating the work into the larger organization. The choice of series and pay plan is based on the same principles as for nonsupervisory oversight positions, that is, series and pay plan are based on the primary knowledges, skills, and abilities required for the position as a whole.

General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG)

The GSSG is used only to grade positions that first meet the minimum coverage requirements of the GSSG for the non-contract workforce. A position that is responsible for supervising Federal civilian employees, military, and/or volunteers, **and** meets the other coverage criteria for these employees, is evaluated by the GSSG. For positions that fully meet the coverage requirements for non-contract employees, the GSSG provides criteria for determining credit for contract work in two key places: 1) a general description under the definition of "supervisor" located in the section headed "Other Definitions", and 2) specific criteria in the definition for Factor 3, level 3-2b. In the first section, the definition of "supervisor" contains a note on technical planning and oversight of work that is to be or has been contracted out. In brief, this states that a supervisor may be credited with this work when the supervisor has technical planning and oversight over contractor-performed work.

The definition of level 3-2b must be used in light of the fact that a position does not meet the coverage requirements of the GSSG through meeting level 3-2b alone. **Positions that direct a workforce solely of contract employees are excluded from GSSG coverage, despite the description of contract oversight duties in paragraph 3-2b, at what is presently the lowest described level for Factor 3.** That caution being stated, the work descriptions in paragraph 3-2b are helpful in determining which contract work may be credited to a position properly covered by the GSSG, in that it contains more specific requirements than the material under "Other Definitions." Paragraph 3-2b emphasizes that a supervisor must perform "a wide range of technical input and oversight tasks comparable to all or nearly all" of the functions listed in the section. These functions are:

1. Analyze benefits and costs of accomplishing work in-house versus contracting; recommend whether to contract;
2. Provide technical requirements and descriptions of the work to be accomplished;
3. Plan and establish the work schedules, deadlines, and standards for acceptable work; coordinate and integrate contractor work schedules and processes with work of subordinates or others;

4. Track progress and quality of performance; arrange for subordinates to conduct any required inspections; and,
5. Decide on the acceptability, rejection, or correction of work products or services, and similar matters that may affect payment to the contractor.

Functions 3 through 5 are key for ongoing service contracts. In these situations, creditable oversight need not include responsibility for recommending whether or not to contract (function 1), but *must* include functions 3 through 5: planning, coordination, tracking, and evaluation of the contract work performed. Function 2, provision and revision of technical requirements, is normally also the supervisor's responsibility. A supervisory position that meets the criteria in either paragraph 3-2a or 3-2c is not awarded extra credit for also meeting paragraph 3-2b. If level 3-3 (3-3a or 3-3b) is not met, level 3-2 is credited at 450 points, whether or not the position also meets 3-2b.

Some supervisors and managers coordinate and integrate contractor work with the work of their subordinates without necessarily exercising any of the other responsibilities listed above. This is found primarily at higher echelons where broad program responsibilities require coordination and liaison across several organizational levels, each of which may employ contract employees. Supervisors and managers should **only** be credited with contract work over which they have direct responsibility for determining standards for acceptable work in terms of quality and progress, and for which they have the authority to decide on acceptance, rejection, or correction of the work performed. That is, to be credited with oversight of this work, the supervisor or manager must have the authority to determine, or to make authoritative recommendations on, payment, withholding or delaying payment, and/or terminating the contract.

Once a position is determined to be supervisory, and creditable contract work identified, the difficulty of the overall workload directed must be assessed (Factor 5). For the contracted work, this means estimating the base level of work performed by the contract employees. Estimates of grade level may be derived by comparing information from contract documents, subordinate supervisors, leaders, and/or staffing studies, with the grading criteria in the standard or standards that most closely describe the contract work being performed. This determination is combined with the base level determination for the non-contractor workforce supervised for the overall evaluation of Factor 5.

Positions Excluded from the GSSG

With the continuing growth of contracting for services previously performed by Federal employees, the varieties of contract oversight situations will increase, including situations where a Federal employee is responsible for directing work performed by a contract workforce. It is particularly difficult, however, to identify appropriate grading criteria for positions with work direction responsibilities for operations using a contract workforce, but that are excluded from coverage of the GSSG. To reiterate, the GSSG **may not be used** to grade positions that are specifically excluded from coverage. The AAGEG is

designed primarily to measure staff duties, not direction of a workforce. However, the AAGEG contains some criteria relevant to leading and coordinating teams that may be helpful as at least a supplementary evaluation tool for two-grade interval positions at higher grade levels. The GS-1910 grading criteria should not be used to measure direction of work performed by a contract workforce even where products are involved, because the grading criteria apply only to personally performed work, and do not contain factors adaptable to direction of an operation.

There is no one standard that can be applied across the board to direction of work performed solely by contractors. Some of the small number of standards that contain specific program management criteria can be applied or adapted with careful interpretation to certain types of contract operations. Standards that contain criteria for program evaluation duties (e.g., the Grade Evaluation Guide for Instructional Work) may be adapted in some cases to direction of two-grade interval contract work, again with careful interpretation.

The following is offered as illustrative and not comprehensive guidance for selecting grading criteria for directing work performed by contract workforces and overseen by GS employees:

A. Trades, crafts, and manual labor work

1. Limited operations. Examples are custodial services, food services, groundskeeping services provided to a small installation. Possibilities for adaptable grading criteria are the GS-018 Safety and Occupational Health Management Series, GS-080 Security Administration Series, GS-802 Engineering Technician Series, GS-809 Construction Control Series, GS-1144 Commissary Store Management Series.
2. Large-scale operations. Examples are some of the services mentioned above for large installations, or more comprehensive services including some higher skill level work, such as facilities operations and maintenance, housing maintenance, other base operations functions of similar skill levels, and depot operations. While the subject-matter knowledge requirements are not high, increasing complexity and size of operations overseen increase the scope and complexity of the direction required. Standards such as GS-1640 Facilities Management, GS-1173 Housing Management, the Grade-Evaluation Guide for Supply Positions, and less directly, GS-670 Health System Administration, along with the GS-1144, GS-018, GS-080, and GS-802 may be considered for evaluating the complex coordinative responsibilities of these types of positions.
3. High-skill operations of varying scope. Examples are aircraft and vehicle maintenance and repair, construction, maintenance of complex facilities. Standards that may offer helpful grading criteria include GS-802 Engineering Technician, Parts III and IV of the GS-810 Civil Engineering Standard or

other engineering standards where professional knowledges are required to oversee the operation, as well as GS-1640 and GS-1173. The GS-670 Health System Administration standard is suggested as a supplementary guide, as is the General Grade-Evaluation Guide for Nonsupervisory Professional Engineering Positions, and the Equipment Development Grade Evaluation Guide (EDGEG).

B. Administrative and Professional Work

1. Limited operations, single-grade interval work. Examples are personnel processing, budget clerk and assistant work, library technician work, security services for a small installation. Single-grade or two-grade interval subject-matter series are the most likely to provide some guidance for directing these types of operations, with supplementation from the AAGEG where appropriate. The GS-802 may be used if the work overseen is engineering technician type work.
2. Large-scale operations, single-grade interval work. Similar types of work as in paragraph 1, but in large organizations, such as consolidated personnel processing centers, payroll, accounting centers. Same as above, but generally using two-grade interval standard and/or the AAGEG; additional evaluation using one or more of the standards with managerial criteria that can be adapted, such as the GS-018, GS-080, GS-1144, GS-1173, in some cases, GS-670, may be needed to fully evaluate all aspects of such positions.
3. Two-grade interval nonprofessional work. A common situation is information technology, such as computer specialist and telecommunications work; another instance may be training operations. Subject-matter standards should be used, supplemented as needed with one or more of the suggested management standards, and/or the AAGEG, as indicated in the above two paragraphs.
4. Professional work, or work that requires professional oversight. Examples are major construction projects, scientific and engineering research and development, libraries, physical science technician work, biological technician work, education specialist or technician work. Governing professional standards are the most likely sources, e.g., engineering standards and grading guides, the GS-1300 Job Family Standard (JFS) for Professional Physical Science Work, GS-1410 Librarian Series Standard, Grade-Level Guide (GLG) for Instructional Work.

Conclusion

There are significant gaps in applicable grading criteria for positions with contract oversight responsibilities. This guidance is intended to clarify the classification tools that

are available and their proper use. In the majority of cases, subject-matter knowledge governs the pay plan and series. The subject-matter standard may provide appropriate grading criteria. In some other situations, more generic knowledges of business practices, management knowledges, or knowledge of specialized evaluation techniques may be the primary requirement. Because there is no single satisfactory approach, each situation must be evaluated individually, and interpretation and sound classification judgment are required for correct evaluation of these positions.

Appendix A

Classification Guidance for Contract Oversight Positions			
Nature of Work	Primary Qualifications Issue	Series	Grading Standards
Non Supervisory	Subject matter knowledge is paramount	Specific subject matter series	Specific subject matter series*
	Combination Knowledges or Subject matter knowledge not paramount	Examples: 301, 802, 809, 1101, 1601, 1910	Subject matter series or adapt, for example, AAGEG, 802, 809
Supervisory#	Subject matter knowledge is paramount	Specific subject matter series	GSSG
	Combination Knowledges or Subject matter knowledge not paramount	Examples: 301, 802, 809, 670, 1101, 1601, 1910	
Contract Workforce Direction	Subject matter knowledge is paramount	Specific subject matter series, or, for example, 080, 1144, 1173, 1640	Specific subject matter series*, or, for example, 018, 080, 670, 810 pt III or IV, 1144, 1173, 1300 JFS, 1410, 1640, GLG for Instructional Work, EDGE G
	Combination Knowledges or Subject matter knowledge not paramount	301, 802, 809, 1101, 1601	Examples; 018, 080, 201 pt II, 670, 810 pt III or IV, 1144, 1173, 1300 JFS, 1640, GLG for Instructional Work, EDGE G, AAGEG

* **Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide (AAGEG)** may be used here as a secondary, or validating, standard along with the primary grading criteria.

If personally performed work accounts for at least 25% of the position's time, use nonsupervisory grading criteria to independently evaluate that work; then classify the job to the highest grade of work performed at least 25% of the time.

Appendix B

The following is intended to serve as an aid to classifiers, and those with delegated classification authority, in exercising their judgment. It is not a substitute for the factor level definitions or other grading criteria found in the classification standards, and is not to be used alone. This list should always be used within the context of the factor level definition (FLD) as a whole, including consideration of illustrations that clarify the full intent of the particular FLD.

Key Factor Level Progressions using the Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide (AAGEG)

Factor 1, Knowledge Required

- 1-6** Standardized guidelines
 Factual situations
 Clear-cut evidence
 Established principles

- 1-7** Analytical and evaluative methods and techniques applied to more complex situations and situations of larger scope; analysis of findings
 Knowledge of major issues, program goals and objectives of situations studied or reviewed
 Recommendations for improvements, changes
 Adapting techniques, evaluation criteria to foster improvements in effectiveness, productivity
 Skill in communicating findings
 Negotiations with contractor

- 1-8** Expert analyst—analysis of complex management processes and systems; expert knowledge of regulatory context
 Comprehensive knowledge of a range of policies, laws, regulations, etc., applicable to important public programs
 Knowledge of agency program goals and objectives to insure that products and services are integrated with overall objectives
 Knowledge of relationships with other programs, functions in own or other agencies

 Limits and boundaries on work studied/evaluated very broad, difficult to determine in advance; limits developed with contractor as project proceeds

 Little guidance, few precedents

 Negotiating with contractor, agency management where substantial agency resources involved, or extensive changes in established procedures may result

Long range (5 year) planning involved

Factor 3, Guidelines

- 3-3** Standard reference materials, analytical methods and techniques; guidelines provide adequate coverage of most work situations
- 3-4** General policies; precedent activities; general outlines with no details; goals and objectives; broad regulatory guides
Work may require employee to develop more specific guidelines, e.g., implementing instructions, specific quality criteria, methods for productivity improvement
- 3-5** Basic agency policy; legislative history; court decisions; state and local laws
Revising and interpreting existing policy, regulations for use by others, including contractors
Developing guidelines for use by others (team members, employees and/or contractors at subordinate echelons), where employee is a recognized expert in development/interpretation of guidance on planning and evaluation in areas such as work force management or productivity improvement
(This level rarely encountered in contract oversight work)

Factor 4, Complexity

- 4-3** Problems and relationships of a procedural nature; collects factual information
Analysis of issues in the assignment; selects accepted, established techniques appropriate to assignment
- Projects are in related organizations, with related functions and objectives
- Observing work in progress, reviewing records to identify and resolve problems (may involve measurement); writing reports
- Work reviewed/evaluated is primarily procedural
- May be member of a team
- 4-4** Substantive issues, problems; application of techniques that require modification to fit a wider range of variables
- Difficulty in measuring effectiveness, productivity due to complexity of work reviewed; work is of a nature that is difficult to document
- Originality required to refine work methods and techniques for measuring/evaluating performance, productivity

- 4-5** Substantive mission-oriented programs, interrelated issues; developing detailed plans for program over the long range or developing evaluation criteria

Conflicting goals and objectives due to changes in regulations, productivity, demand for program services

Assignments involve value judgments; performance measurement primarily in predictive terms; findings/conclusions subjective, not readily verifiable through repeating the review or reevaluating results

Options, recommendations, conclusions include uncertainties about data and other variables that affect long-range program performance; assignments may include need to develop currently unavailable data about program accomplishments; measurements of effectiveness may be ambiguous, requiring development of new information, criteria, or approaches to program evaluation that set precedent

- 4-6** Broad assignments that involve the substance of key agency programs, often requiring team leadership over specialists in a variety of areas; requires direction of team, coordination of efforts, consolidating findings or other outputs.

Extreme difficulty in identifying issues or problems, and in planning, organizing; difficulty in translating policy intent into program actions

Programs typically driven by new or revised legislation, requiring consideration of long-range effects on other government programs, private industry; evaluation assignments require development of new ways to measure program results, effectiveness

Factor 5, Scope and Effect

- 5-3** Work involves primarily administrative support activities, with conventional problems and situations; may involve developing detailed procedures and guidelines to supplement established administrative regulations, program guidance

Work influence decisions by management on efficiency and productivity of administrative operations

- 5-4** Work involves evaluation of effectiveness, efficiency of program operations or resolving problems of administrative support and staff activities, including establishing criteria for measuring, predicting attainment of program or organizational goals and objectives; may involve developing administrative regulations, or program guidance across organizational lines; or evaluation of program effectiveness at the operating level

Work affects program operations or administrative support at different echelons and/or geographical locations within the organization; may affect administrative work in components of other agencies

- 5-5** Analysis and evaluation of major administrative aspects of substantive, mission-oriented programs, such as program(s) conducted throughout a major command or major subordinate command, or a large complex multi-mission field activity; identification and development of ways to resolve problems or cope with issues directly affecting program goals and objectives; may involve development of new criteria for measuring program accomplishments and degree of attainment of goals and objectives

Work outcomes are of major significance to top agency management; may include recommendations for actions that would significantly change major administrative aspects of missions or programs, or substantially affect quality and quantity of services provided by contractors

- 5-6** Scope involves programs of significant interest to the public and Congress, and work often affects several departments and agencies. This level would be very unlikely in contract oversight assignments.

Note: Tables showing typical patterns of factor levels (illustrations of factor level relationships) are found at the end of Chapter 2, The Factor Evaluation System, of The Classifier's Handbook.